UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,980	10/16/2003	Dirk Lauhoff	TRW(AEC)6781	8114
	5294 7590 02/19/2008 CAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL & TUMMINO L.L.P.		EXAMINER	
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700		WILSON, GREGORY A		
CLEVEVLANI	LAND, OH 44114		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3749	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/686,980	LAUHOFF, DIRK
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gregory A. Wilson	3749
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLAY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY OF THE MAILING	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 (2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)    This action is application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 6-8 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdres 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 6-8 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.  /or election requirement.	
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examir</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac</li> <li>Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E</li> </ul>	ecepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Selection is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal I 6)  Other:	oate

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Prosecution on the merits of this application is reopened on claims 6-8 considered unpatentable for the reasons indicated below:

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 6-8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the amendment received 3/22/06 the applicant amended claim 6 to include the limitation that the antenna body is integrated into the plastic material of the frame by injection-molding "and is completely covered with the plastic material of the frame" however this limitation was not described in the specification in this manner and herein constitutes new matter.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/686,980 Page 3

Art Unit: 3749

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Stiehl (2003/0022616). Stiehl teaches an air vent (10) for use in a vehicle, including a frame (12) made of plastic (SEE [0017]), a T-shaped antenna (62) having a middle bar (64) and a crossbar (66), a connector plug (60). When placed in the vehicle interior, the antenna is covered by the plastic, but is not described as being integrated (ie: integral) with the plastic material. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have integrated the antenna into the plastic since such a modification would not affect the performance of the antenna, nor does it solve any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and it has been held that the term "integral" and its derivative is sufficiently broad to embrace constructions united by such means as fastening and welding.

## Response to Arguments

Prosecution on the merits have been reopened to address the amendment made 3/22/06 which introduces new matter into the claims which is not disclosed in the original specification, and was not properly addressed in the office actions that followed. Applicant argues that Stiehl does not teach or suggest that an antenna body and the plastic material of the frame are integrally molded such that the antenna body is

embedded in and completely surrounded by the plastic material of the frame and furthermore offers that the object of Stiehl is to accommodate an antenna in a vehicle so that it has a good transceiver performance while being simple to fit and that having antenna fitted to the frame (12) in the manner disclosed by Stiehl so as to achieve a simple fit is entirely different than providing an antenna embedded in a frame so as to completely surround the antenna with the plastic material of the frame. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Stiehl discloses an antenna (62) that when mounted into the vehicle, the antenna will be sandwiched in between the plastic frame structure (12) and the vehicle in which the frame structure is mounted to, additionally the term "embedded" is defined in the dictionary (Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary) as "to fix securely in a surrounding mass". The antenna will be completely surrounded and therefore meet the applicants need of not being affected by deterioration by environmental influences while also meeting the dictionary definition of the term "embedded". This clearly shows that the applicants condition can be met without having to be integrally molded into the plastic and it is for this reason the examiner maintains his position that "integrally molded" is an obvious matter of design choice.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory A. Wilson whose telephone number is (571)272-4882. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 am - 4:30 pm EST.

Application/Control Number: 10/686,980 Page 5

Art Unit: 3749

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve McAllister can be reached on (571) 272-6785. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregory A. Wilson/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3749

February 14, 2008